

### Remarks

Claim 158 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as being indefinite. The Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's helpful comments in that regard. Claim 158 has accordingly been amended to remove "one of" to clarify that claim and make it definite. Claim 159 has also been amended in the same way to address the same issue.

Claims 158 – 160 stand rejected over the hypothetical combination of Yoshida with Nanto. The Applicants again note with appreciation the Examiner's helpful comments applying that combination to the claims. The Applicants further note with appreciation the Examiner's additional helpful comments with respect to the unexpected results. The Applicants respectfully submit that the hypothetical combination fails to teach or suggest the subject matter of Claims 158 – 160 for the reasons set forth below.

As noted above, the Examiner acknowledges the showing of unexpected results but notes that the claims are not commensurate in scope because:

the claims do not require that the phosphor paste is discharged into all of the spaces to be coated with the phosphor paste for a particular color between the barrier ribs during a one time relative movement.


The Applicants have amended Claims 158 and 159 in the last two lines to recite that the phosphor paste continuously flows downwardly from all of the holes for each color of the phosphor paste at the same time into all of the spaces to be coated between the barrier ribs during a one time relative movement between the paste applicator and the substrate. The Applicants have accordingly adopted the Examiner's exact language to the extent that it fits into the existing claim language. Thus, Claims 158 and 159 have directly incorporated the "into all of the spaces to be coated" language and the "during a one time relative movement" language. The Applicants therefore respectfully submit that Claims 158 and 159 are now completely commensurate in

scope with the unexpected results previously demonstrated. Therefore, even if one skilled in the art were to make the hypothetical combination, that hypothetical combination would not result in the methods of Claims 158 and 159 or the unexpected results demonstrated and affirmatively claimed by the Applicants. Withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 158 and 159 is respectfully requested.

Claim 160 is an apparatus claim and has been amended in a similar fashion. Accordingly, Claim 160 also now explicitly includes the "into all of the spaces to be coated" language as well as the "during a one time relative movement" language. The Applicants therefore respectfully submit that Claim 160 is also now commensurate in scope with the unexpected results. Thus, even if one skilled in the art hypothetically combined Yoshiba with Nanto, the apparatus would still not result in the Applicants' claimed subject matter and would not achieve the unexpected results previously established by the Applicants. Withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103 rejection is respectfully requested.

In light of the foregoing, the Applicants respectfully submit that the entire Application is now in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



T. Daniel Christenbury  
Reg. No. 31,750  
Attorney for Applicants

TDC:rb  
(215)656-3381